Case 1:18-cr-00328-KPF Document 61 Filed 12/04/18 Page 1 of 41

IAVTMAJP 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 18 CR 328 (KPF) V. 5 AMIN MAJIDI, 6 Defendant. -----x 7 8 New York, N.Y. October 31, 2018 9 4:00 p.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. KATHERINE P. FAILLA, 12 District Judge 13 14 APPEARANCES GEOFFREY S. BERMAN 15 United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York JOSHUA NAFTALIS 17 MAX NICHOLAS Assistant United States Attorneys 18 CLAYMAN & ROSENBERG 19 Attorneys for Defendant SETH ROSENBERG 20 BRIAN LINDER 21 22 23 24 25

1 (Case called) MR. NAFTALIS: Good afternoon, your Honor, Josh 2 3 Naftalis and Max Nicholas for the government. With us at 4 counsel table Matt Mahaffey from the FBI. 5 THE COURT: Thank you all. Good afternoon. 6 MR. ROSENBERG: Good afternoon, your Honor, Seth 7 Rosenberg and Brian Linder for Mr. Majidi. 8 THE COURT: Good afternoon, gentlemen, and Mr. Majidi, 9 good afternoon to you as well. 10 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, good afternoon. 11 THE COURT: Mr. Rosenberg, do you have a copy of the 12 indictment in this case? 13 MR. ROSENBERG: We do, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Thank you. And do you also have a copy of the letter to you and to Mr. Linder that is dated October 19 of 15 16 this year? 17 MR. ROSENBERG: We do. 18 THE COURT: And I believe you just placed both of 19 these in front of Mr. Majidi, am I correct? 20 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes. 21 THE COURT: Let me ask the parties something before I 22 begin, is there a position of the parties with respect to 23 whether this transcript should be sealed or not?

MR. NAFTALIS: We don't think it needs to be, your

24

25

Honor.

THE COURT: That was my question, thank you very much for letting me know.

Sir, Mr. Rosenberg, to ask the extent I am directing questions to Mr. one of Majidi's counsel, should I be directing them to you in the first instance?

MR. ROSENBERG: Probably Mr. Linder would be your better choice.

THE COURT: I'm not going to opine on that, I want to make sure I'm asking the right person.

Mr. Majidi, your attorney has placed in front of you a copy of the indictment in this case, and he's placed in front of you a copy of a letter from the U.S. Attorney's Office. You may recall, sir, that at a prior proceeding before me you were arraigned on this indictment. I asked you a series of questions and you gave me a series of answers. Do you recall that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: And at that time my recollection is that you entered a plea of not guilty to the charges contained in the indictment. Am I also correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: It is my understanding, sir, that today you wish to change your plea and you wish to enter a plea of guilty to Counts One, Two, Three and Four of the indictment in this case, am I correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And let me talk to you about this, please, sir. Before I can accept a guilty plea from you, I need to ask you a series of questions, so let me please explain to you the purposes that those questions serve.

The first thing that I need to determine is that you are competent to enter a plea of guilty, you can see and hear and understand what is going on in the courtroom, and you're not under any influence that might impair you in your ability to perceive what is going on in the courtroom.

If I find you are competent, I will talk to you about the rights that you have and that you would be waiving by entering a plea of guilty. I will talk to you about the charges to which you propose to plead guilty and the penalties that are associated with those charges. And finally, I will ask you what it is you did that makes you believe that you are guilty of these offenses.

As you might imagine, Mr. Majidi, there are a number of questions that I need to ask you. They're all important. If at any time you cannot understand one of my questions, or if at any time for any reason you wish to take a break in these proceedings, let me know. If I do not hear from you, I will understand that you are hearing and understanding each of the questions that I'm asking.

Is that our understanding, sir?

| 1 | THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor, yes. |
|----|---|
| 2 | THE COURT: Ms. Noriega, could you please swear in |
| 3 | Mr. Majidi. |
| 4 | (Defendant sworn) |
| 5 | DEPUTY CLERK: Please state your name for the record. |
| 6 | THE DEFENDANT: Amni Majidi. |
| 7 | DEPUTY CLERK: Thank you, you may be seated. |
| 8 | THE COURT: Mr. Majidi, the significance of my placing |
| 9 | you under oath is that if you were to answer any of the |
| 10 | questions that I'm about to ask you falsely, you could be |
| 11 | prosecuted for a separate offense, and that offense is known as |
| 12 | perjury. Do you understand that, sir? |
| 13 | THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. |
| 14 | THE COURT: Mr. Majidi, how old are you? |
| 15 | THE DEFENDANT: 52. |
| 16 | THE COURT: How far did you go in school, sir? |
| 17 | THE DEFENDANT: I have my bachelor's degree from |
| 18 | university and some graduate studies. |
| 19 | THE COURT: Have you ever been treated or hospitalized |
| 20 | for any form of mental illness? |
| 21 | THE DEFENDANT: No. |
| 22 | THE COURT: Are you now or have you recently been |
| 23 | under the care of a doctor or a psychiatrist? |
| 24 | THE DEFENDANT: Yes. |
| 25 | THE COURT: And I'm going to ask you to bring the |

microphone that's to your left a little closer to you. 1 Are you under the care of a doctor at this time or a 2 3 psychiatrist? THE DEFENDANT: Psychiatrist. 4 5 THE COURT: 6 7 THE DEFENDANT: 8 9 THE COURT: 10 THE DEFENDANT: 11 12 THE COURT: 13 14 THE DEFENDANT: 15 THE COURT: 16 17 THE DEFENDANT: 18 19 THE COURT: 20 21 THE DEFENDANT: 22 THE COURT: 23 THE DEFENDANT: 24 25

| 1 | THE COURT: |
|----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | THE DEFENDANT: |
| 4 | THE COURT: Does that have any affect of dulling your |
| 5 | mind or impairing in any way your ability to see, hear, or |
| 6 | understand what is going on in the courtroom today? |
| 7 | THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am. |
| 8 | THE COURT: |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | THE DEFENDANT: |
| 12 | THE COURT: And other than your relationship with this |
| 13 | psychiatrist, is there any other medical or mental health |
| 14 | treatment that you are receiving at this time? |
| 15 | THE DEFENDANT: No. |
| 16 | THE COURT: Have you ever been treated or hospitalized |
| 17 | for any form of addiction, including drug or alcohol addiction? |
| 18 | THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. |
| 19 | THE COURT: |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | THE DEFENDANT: |
| 23 | |
| 24 | THE COURT: |
| 25 | |

TAVTMAJP 1 THE DEFENDANT: THE COURT: In any way are you impaired as a 2 3 consequence of any medication you may be taking for any medical or mental health condition? 4 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 5 6 THE COURT: Were there any other drugs, medicine or 7 pills that you took in the last two days? THE DEFENDANT: No. 8 9 THE COURT: In the last two days have you consumed any 10 alcoholic beverages? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I shared a beer with my wife last 12 night. 13 THE COURT: May I imagine, sir, that you're not today 14 feeling the effect of the beer you shared with your wife last 15 night? That is correct. 16 THE DEFENDANT: 17 THE COURT: And so there's no impairment occasioned by that? 18 19 THE DEFENDANT: No. 20 THE COURT: Is your mind clear today, sir? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 22 THE COURT: Do you understand what is happening in the 23 courtroom today? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Mr. Linder, let me turn to you, please.

25

21

22

23

24

25

Have you and your colleague had enough time to discuss this 1 matter with your client? 2 3 MR. LINDER: We have, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Do you believe that he is capable of 5 understanding the rights that he has and that he would be 6 waiving by entering a plea of guilty? 7 MR. LINDER: We do. 8 THE COURT: Do you believe as well that he is capable 9 of understanding the nature of these proceedings this 10 afternoon? 11 MR. LINDER: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Do you have any doubt as to your client's 13 competence to plead quilty if that is what he wishes to do? 14 MR. LINDER: None whatsoever. 15 THE COURT: Mr. Naftalis, do you have any doubt as to Mr. Majidi's competence to plead quilty if that is what he 16 17 wishes to do? 18 MR. NAFTALIS: No, your Honor. 19

THE COURT: Should I be directing questions to you or to Mr. Nicholas?

MR. NAFTALIS: To me is fine, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Majidi, based on the discussions that I have had with you for the past few minutes, and that includes both your answers to my questions and my observations of your demeanor

here in court, and based as well on the discussions that I just had with your attorneys and with the attorneys for the government, I find that you are fully competent to enter a knowing and informed plea of guilty if that is what you wish to to.

I have had your attorney place before you the indictment in this case. And I know I asked you questions about it previously, but some of them are sufficiently important that I'm going to ask them a second time. Have you read this indictment, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Have you had whatever time you needed to discuss with your attorneys the charges to which you propose to plead guilty and any defenses that you might have to those charges?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't want the specifics of any communication you may have had with your attorneys because those communications are privileged, but I would like to know generally, have your attorneys explained to you the consequences of entering a plea of guilty in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, they have.

THE COURT: Are you satisfied with their representation of you in this matter?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, very much so.

THE COURT: I'm going to now explain to you certain rights that you have and would be waiving by entering a plea of guilty. I know you have been following me very carefully and I ask you to continue doing that, and I remind you of your earlier agreement if there's something that you don't understand or some other reason why you would like to take a break, you will let me know.

Sir, under the Constitution and laws of the United States, you have the right to continue with your pleas of not guilty to the charges contained in the indictment. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: If you continued with your pleas of not guilty, you would be entitled to a speedy and public trial by a jury on the charges in this indictment. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: At a trial you would be presumed to be innocent and the government would be required to prove you guilty by competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt before you could be found guilty. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: A jury of twelve people would have to agree unanimously that you were guilty. You would not have to prove that you were innocent of these charges if you were to

proceed to trial. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: At a trial and at every stage of your prosecution you are entitled to the assistance of an attorney. If and to the extent you cannot afford an attorney, one would be appointed for you at public expense free of cost to you in order to represent you. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial in this case, the witnesses for the government would have to come into court and testify in your presence. Your attorneys could cross-examine the witnesses for the government, they could object to evidence offered by the government, they could offer evidence on your own behalf if you wanted them to do so. You would also have the right to have subpoenas or other documents or process used in order to compel witnesses to testify in your defense. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, yes.

THE COURT: If there were a trial in this case, you would have the right to testify if you wanted to do so, and you would have the right not to testify if you wanted not to do so. If you decided not to testify, no one, including the jury, could draw any inference or suggestion of guilt from your decision not to testify. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, yes.

THE COURT: Another consequence of entering a guilty plea in this particular manner is that you give up your right to seek supression or exclusion of the government's evidence against you. Are you aware of that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.

THE COURT: Without giving me the specifics of your communications, have you and your attorneys had a sufficient opportunity to discuss whether there is a basis for you to seek supression or exclusion of part or all of the government's evidence against you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, we have.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that if you were convicted after a trial, you would have the right to appeal from the jury's verdict?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And even now as you are preparing to enter this guilty plea, you have the right to change your mind and to continue with your previously entered plea of not guilty to these charges. Are you aware of that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Majidi, if you plead guilty and if I accept your guilty plea, you will give up your right to trial and the other rights I have been discussing with you, other than your right to an attorney. You have the right to an attorney whether you plead guilty or go to trial. But if you

plead guilty, and if I accept your guilty plea, there will be no trial I will enter a judgment of guilty on Counts One through Four of the indictment.

I will sentence you at a later date based on information that I receive from you today, information that I receive from the United States Probation Office in a document known as a presentence investigation report, and information that I receive from you and your attorneys and from the attorneys for the government in connection with sentencing.

If you plead guilty, and if I accept your guilty plea, there will be no appeal on the issue of whether you committed the offenses charged in the indictment, and there would be no appeal on the issue of whether the government could use the evidence that it has against you.

Now I know I said a number of things there, sir, but were you able to follow me as I said them?

THE DEFENDANT: I followed them completely, yes.

THE COURT: Did you understand each of the things I was saying to you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that if you plead guilty there is a degree to which you have to give up your right not to incriminate yourself? And what I mean by that is I will ask you questions later in this proceeding to confirm for myself that you are pleading guilty because you are in fact

guilty and not for some other reason, and you will have to admit and acknowledge your guilt of the offenses to which you plead guilty. Are you aware of that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.

THE COURT: Mr. Majidi, are you aware of each of the rights I have been discussing with you?

THE DEFENDANT: I am, yes.

THE COURT: Would you like me or your attorneys to provide any additional or clarifying information about any of these rights?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: And are you willing to give up your right to trial and the other rights I have been discussing with you and enter a plea of guilty in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: It is my understanding that you are proposing to plead guilty to four charges in this case, am I correct, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: It is my understanding that you are proposing to plead guilty to conspiracy to commit securities fraud in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371; conspiracy to commit wire fraud in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1349; securities fraud in violation of Title 15, United States Code, Sections 78jb and 78ff, and

Title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 240.10(b)(5), and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2; and in Count Four, wire fraud in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1343 and 2.

So there are four counts to which you propose to plead guilty. Is that your understanding as well, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are the particular offenses that I just recited to you the offenses to which you propose to plead quilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Majidi, I'm going to ask for your attention, and I will give mine as well, as we ask the government to recite for both of us the elements of each of these offenses.

Mr. Naftalis, thank you.

MR. NAFTALIS: Yes, your Honor. Starting with Count One, conspiracy to commit securities fraud, if the case were to proceed to trial the government would prove the following three elements beyond a reasonable doubt: First, the existence of an agreement or understanding to commit the unlawful object of the charged conspiracy, here securities fraud; second, that the defendant willfully and knowingly became a member of that conspiracy and joined in it; and third, that at least one of the co-conspirators committed an overt act in furtherance of

the conspiracy.

The object of the conspiracy, as I mentioned, is securities fraud, and that is charged as a substantive count in Count Three. I will read the elements of that offense now. First, in connection with a purchase or sale of security, the defendant did any one or more of the following:

One, employ a device, scheme or artifice to defraud, or two, made an untrue statement of a material fact or omitted to state a material fact which made what was said under the circumstances misleading; or three, engage in an act, practice, or course of business that operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon a purchaser or seller.

Second, the defendant acted willfully, knowingly and with the intent to defraud.

Third, the defendant knowingly used, or caused to be used, A, any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce, or B, the use of the mails in furtherance of the fraudulent conduct.

Now turning to Count Two, which is conspiracy to commit wire fraud, there are two elements of that offense. I basically already said them, but I will repeat them: First, the existence of an agreement or understanding to commit the unlawful object of the conspiracy, here wire fraud; and second, the defendant willfully and knowingly became a member of that conspiracy and joined in it; and then, as I mentioned, the

object is wire fraud.

The elements of wire fraud, which are also charged as a substantive offense in Count Four, are the following: First, that there was either a scheme or artifice to defraud, or to obtain money or property by materially false and fraudulent pretenses, representations and/or promises; second, that the defendant knowingly and willfully participated in the scheme or artifice to defraud with knowledge of its fraudulent nature and with specific intent to defraud, or that the defendant knowingly and intentionally aided and abetted others in the scheme; third, that in the execution of that scheme, the defendant used or caused the use of private or interstate carrier or interstate wires. We would prove venue by a preponderance.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Mr. Majidi, I understand there was a lot to hear, but I saw you were following along, and may I confirm that you were following along as the prosecutor outlined the elements of the offense?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I was.

THE COURT: Thank you. Do you understand, sir, that if you were to proceed to trial, that is what the government would have to prove at trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: What I would like to do now, sir, is talk

to you about the penalties that are associated with these offenses, and I'm going to focus on the maximum possible penalties that are associated with each. I'm are deliberately using the term "maximum," sir, because I want you to understand the most that could possibly be imposed. I'm not saying this is necessarily what you're going to receive.

I do want to make sure that you understand that by pleading guilty you would be subjecting yourself or exposing yourself to the possibility of receiving any combination of punishments up to the statutory maximum terms that I'm about to describe. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: I'm going to focus first on restrictions on your liberty. The maximum term of imprisonment for these offenses vary, so let me go through them with you. The maximum term of imprisonment for Count One is five years, the maximum term of imprisonment for Count Two is 20 years, the maximum term of imprisonment for Count Three is 20 years, and the maximum term of imprisonment for Count Four is 20 years.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: And do you understand as well that any term of imprisonment that I might impose could be followed by a term of supervised release? And I will talk to you about those terms in a moment, but first of all, are you familiar with the

concept of supervised release?

THE DEFENDANT: I am.

THE COURT: And so let me review with you, please, the maximum terms of supervised release for each of these offenses. The maximum term of supervised release for Count One is three years, for Count Two is three years, for Count Three is three years, and for Count Four is three years. These would run concurrently, sir, so the maximum term effectively would be three years supervised release.

Let me talk to you, please, for a moment about supervised release, because I want to make sure that you and I have the same understanding when I use the term.

When I use the term "supervised release," what I am referring to is a period of time where you would be subject to supervision by the United States Probation Office. There would be terms and conditions of supervised release that you would have to follow, and if you were unable to follow those terms and conditions of supervised release the possibility exists that your term of supervised release could be revoked and you could be sent to prison to serve time without a jury trial.

If your term of supervised release were revoked, you would not get any credit for any time that you had served as a term of imprisonment. You would also not get any credit for any time that you had spent on supervised release in compliance with the terms of supervised release.

Do you understand each of those things, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that there is no parole in the federal system. If you are sentenced to a term of imprisonment you would not be released early on parole. There is an opportunity to earn credit for good behavior, but even then you would have to serve at least approximately 85 percent of any term of imprisonment imposed. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: At the beginning of this discussion in this area we talked about the maximum terms of imprisonment. Do you understand that the aggregate maximum term of imprisonment in this case is 65 years imprisonment?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: In addition to these restrictions on your liberty, the maximum possible punishment also includes certain financial penalties. The maximum allowable fine in this case varies with each count, but let me review with you each of them. It tends to be the greatest of one of three things, either a number or twice the gross pecuniary gain derived from the offense or twice the gross pecuniary loss to persons other than yourself. For Count One, that number is \$250,000, for Count Two, it is \$250,000, for Count Three it is \$5 million, and for Count Four it is \$250,000.

In addition, I could order restitution to any person or entity who has been injured as a result of your conduct. I can order you to forfeit any proceeds that you may have derived from the offense or any property that you may have used to commit or to facilitate the commission of the offense, and I must order a mandatory special assessment of \$100 per count of conviction, so in this case, \$400.

Do you understand that those are the maximum possible penalties to which you are subjected in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Majidi, I have a series of questions that I must ask you, and it's my expectation that not all of them will be relevant to you. I will explain to you why I'm asking them as I do, but I want to preface it by saying they're not all relevant.

I will begin by asking: Are you a United States citizen, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.

THE COURT: I ask that because some people who appear before me are not. A guilty plea can have adverse immigration consequences. But since you are a citizen, they would not have those consequences. I will ask you something different.

Do you understand that as a result of your guilty plea you could lose certain valuable civil rights, to the extent you have them today or could obtain them in the future? These

would include the right to vote, the right to serve on a jury, 1 the right to hold public office, and the right to possess a 2 3 firearm. Are you aware of that, sir? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am. 5 THE COURT: Mr. Majidi, are you serving any other 6 sentence at this time? 7 THE DEFENDANT: No. THE COURT: To the best of your knowledge, sir, are 8 9 you being prosecuted in any other jurisdiction at this time? 10 THE DEFENDANT: I am not. 11 THE COURT: Is there a concurrent SEC matter in this 12 case, a civil action? 13 MR. NAFTALIS: Yes, your Honor, it's before Judge 14 Nathan and it's stayed right now. 15 THE COURT: Thank you very much. Mr. Majidi, do you understand that the case before 16 17 Judge Nathan is, of course, different; related, but different. 18 Do you understand that resolving the case before me would not 19 resolve other cases that you might have before other judges? 20 Are you aware of that, sir? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: I'm going to ask you a different set of 23 questions now that I know this is the one criminal case that

communications, have you discussed with your attorneys the

you have. Without giving me the specifics of your

24

25

1 process of sentencing? 2 I have. THE DEFENDANT: 3 THE COURT: And do you understand that in connection 4 with sentencing I must review certain factors that are set 5 forth in a statute, and they're commonly referred to as 3553(a) 6 factors because that's the statutory provision where they're 7 contained. So do you understand that there are sentencing factors that I must consider in connection with sentencing you? 8 9 THE DEFENDANT: I do. 10 THE COURT: Do you understand that one of the factors 11 that I must consider is something called the United States 12 Sentencing Guidelines? 13 THE DEFENDANT: I know about that, yes. 14 THE COURT: Can I understand that you may have spoken 15 with your attorneys about the sentencing guidelines? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 17 THE COURT: And if I use the term "quidelines" or 18 "sentencing guidelines," that's what I'm referring to. Will 19 you understand that, sir? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 21 THE COURT: I want to make sure that you understand 22 that if anyone has attempted to predict for you what your 23 ultimate sentence will be, their prediction could be incorrect.

I will be the judge who will be sentencing you, and I don't

have the information that I need today to sentence you

24

25

properly. I need to hear from you later on in this proceeding, I need to hear from the probation office and the presentence investigation report, and I need to hear from you and your attorneys and from the attorneys for the government in connection with sentencing. So do you understand, sir, that today no one can predict with any confidence what your ultimate sentence will be?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that if your ultimate sentence is different from what anyone may have suggested to you that it might be, if it is different from what you yourself expected or hoped for, if it is different from any guidelines range that may have been discussed in your dealings with the government, you would still be bound by your guilty plea, you would not be able to withdraw your plea of guilty based merely on dissatisfaction with your sentence. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: It is my understanding that there is a written plea agreement between you and the government with respect to your plea today. Am I correct, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I have been given a document, it is a letter dated October 19 of this year, from the United States Attorney's Office to your attorneys, Mr. Rosenberg and

```
1
     Mr. Linder.
               Do you have a copy of that letter from front of you,
 2
 3
      sir?
 4
               THE DEFENDANT: I do, yes.
 5
               THE COURT: The copy that I have I will mark as Court
      Exhibit 1 and give to the government at the end of this
6
 7
      proceeding to keep safe.
8
               Could I ask you to turn to last page of your document,
9
      for me, that is page 5.
10
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
11
               THE COURT: Is that also the last page for you, as
12
      well?
13
               THE DEFENDANT: Page 5, yes.
14
               THE COURT: Are there four signatures on your page 5?
15
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
               THE COURT: Is one of the signatures yours?
16
17
               THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely, yes.
18
               THE COURT: Did you sign this document today, sir?
               THE DEFENDANT: I did.
19
20
               THE COURT: Did you sign it in the presence of your
21
      attorneys?
22
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
23
               THE COURT: Before you signed this document, did you
24
      read it?
25
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
```

THE COURT: Did you have whatever time you needed to 1 have with your attorneys to review the document? 2 3 THE DEFENDANT: I did. 4 THE COURT: At the time you signed it, sir, did you 5 understand this document? 6 THE DEFENDANT: I did. 7 THE COURT: I will not review every piece of it with you but there are a few points I would like to review. 8 9 I'm going to ask you please to turn to page 2. Let me 10 know when you've gotten to page 2. 11 THE DEFENDANT: I'm there. 12 THE COURT: Thank you very much. Sir, I'm directing 13 your attention to the third full paragraph of that page, which 14 begins, "It is further understood." Do you see that, sir? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. 16 THE COURT: It is my understanding that in this 17 paragraph you are agreeing to make restitution in an amount 18 that I might determine later pursuant to various provisions of 19 the United States Code. Are you agreeing to make restitution 20 if and to the extent that I determine that there are 21 individuals or entities who have been injured as a result of 22 your conduct? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand that. 23 24 THE COURT: And you are making that agreement, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

25

THE COURT: In the next paragraph, sir, it is my 1 2 understanding that you are admitting to the forfeiture 3 allegation that is associated with Counts One through Four of 4 the indictment, and you are agreeing to forfeit any proceeds 5 you may have derived from the offense or any property that you may have used to commit or facilitate the commission of the 6 7 offense, am I correct? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I agree. 9 THE COURT: So I could ask this technical question: 10 Are you admitting to the forfeiture allegation? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Thank you. I'm looking at the paragraph 13 that follows that, sir, the one that begins, "It is 14 understood, " and I understand this paragraph to be a list of 15 undertakings that you are going to do with the government in 16 this case. Is that your understanding as well? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is, your Honor. THE COURT: And I can read each one of those 18 19 separately, but you have read this paragraph, yes, sir? 20 THE DEFENDANT: I read it carefully, yes. 21 THE COURT: And you are agreeing to do all of the 22 things that you commit to in this paragraph? 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 24 THE COURT: Could I ask you, please, to turn to page 3 25 and tell me when you have gotten to page 3.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm there.

THE COURT: I'm looking at the very bottom of page 3, the last paragraph, and actually I'm looking at the paragraph before that as well. These paragraphs address things that can happen if it is determined that you have violated a term of this agreement or if you have committed additional crimes or given false testimony or committed other violations, that there are certain consequences to that. Have you read those paragraphs, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I have.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you commit the acts described in those paragraphs, the possibility exists that the government could take certain consequences?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Majidi, we have been talking about this agreement for a few moments now. Does this written plea agreement I marked as Court Exhibit 1 constitute your complete and total understanding of your agreement with the government?

THE DEFENDANT: It does.

THE COURT: To the best of your knowledge, sir, has anything been left out?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Other than what is written in this agreement, has anyone made you any promise or offered you any type of inducement in order to get you to sign this agreement

1 or to plead quilty here today? 2 THE DEFENDANT: No. 3 THE COURT: Has anyone threatened you or forced you to 4 to plead guilty here today or to sign this agreement? 5 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Has anyone made any promise to you as to 7 what your ultimate sentence will be? THE DEFENDANT: 8 No. 9 THE COURT: Earlier you heard me refer to guidelines and the sentencing guidelines. Do you recall that part of our 10 11 discussion, sir? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Of course, yes. 13 THE COURT: Do you understand that even if the parties 14 have discussed how the guidelines might apply in your case, I 15 have an independent obligation to calculate the guidelines? 16 Are you aware of that? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am. 18 THE COURT: And so if my correctly calculated 19 guidelines range were to come out to something different from 20 what you may have discussed with your attorneys or with the 21 government or anyone else, do you understand that that would 22 not be a basis for you to withdraw your plea? 23 THE DEFENDANT: I do understand, yes. 24 THE COURT: Mr. Majidi, could you please tell me in 25 your own words what it is that did you that makes you believe

that you are guilty of Counts One through Four of the indictment. Why don't I begin by asking: Do you have written notes with you, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: That's very common. And are they to aid you in speaking with me today?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: The only thing that matters to me is that the thoughts expressed in those notes are yours. Are they, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: They are mine.

THE COURT: I would be happy to hear them. Thank you. And I will ask you, please, to speak slower and louder than you think you need to.

THE DEFENDANT: Between 2014 and 2016 I was employed at Premium Point Investment, or PPI, an investment advisor located in Manhattan.

During that time I was a portfolio manager for the mortgage credit fund, a hedge fund that invested in, among other things, residential mortgage backed securities. The month's end net asset value of the funds that PPI managed was an important measure of the funds' performance and was disseminated to investors and potential investors through the mail and interstate wire communications. The funds' net asset value and their performance also determined PPI's management

fees and performance fees.

Between 2014 and 2016, I participated in a scheme with, among others, Neil Ahuja, CEO of PPI, and Jeremy Shor, a trader at PPI, to fraudulently inflate the net asset value of the funds that PPI managed. Instead of marking securities in PPI's portfolio at their fair market value, I worked with Ahuja, Shor, and others, to mismark their value. I knew that the resulting monthly net asset value was inflated for the purpose of deceiving investors as to the fund's performance.

I knew that what I was doing was wrong.

THE COURT: Is there anything else that you would like me to know, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Please be seated. Thank you.

You indicated to me just a moment ago that when you were engaged in this conduct you understood that it was wrong. Did you also understand that it was illegal?

THE DEFENDANT: I did not, no.

THE COURT: You did not at that time. At some point --

MR. NAFTALIS: Could we --

THE COURT: Yes.

(Pause)

THE DEFENDANT: Let me rephrase. At the time I was uncomfortable with my conduct and I knew that by inflating the

net asset values for the investors I was committing something wrong and potentially illegal. And illegal, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So either at the beginning of your involvement in this matter or over time you came to realize the conduct in which you were engaged was illegal, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Linder, do you know of any valid defense that would prevail at trial or any other reason why your client should not be permitted to plead guilty to Counts One through Four?

MR. LINDER: I do not, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Naftalis, are there additional questions that you would like me to ask Mr. Majidi, or are there proffers you would like to make regarding any interstate elements of the offenses. He did make mention of both mails and wires, so I assume that the wire element has been satisfied, but I will hear from you if you think otherwise.

MR. NAFTALIS: We think the allocution is sufficient. We will represent that there were interstate wires, including emails, text messages, and there were also mailings. So we think the interstate elements of both the wire fraud and securities fraud are satisfied.

THE COURT: I also heard Mr. Majidi to say that he understood the purpose of changing or modifying the net asset

value figures was in part to deceive investors, so I understood that to be an adequate explication of the intent to defraud.

Do you agree?

MR. NAFTALIS: We agree.

THE COURT: Would you tell me, sir, at a high level the types of evidence that would be introduced if this case were to go to trial?

MR. NAFTALIS: Yes, your Honor. The evidence would consist of both witness testimony and documentary evidence. The witness testimony includes cooperating witnesses and lay witnesses. The documentary evidence includes emails, text messages, trading records, and would establish that between 2014 and 2016 Mr. Majidi, Mr. Ahuja and Mr. Shor and others conspired and did mismark and inflate the value of securities in PPI's portfolio and misled their investors to defraud them.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Majidi, were you able to hear the prosecutor just now?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand, sir, that if your case were to proceed to trial that is part or all of the government's evidence against you at that trial?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: Mr. Linder, do you agree there is a sufficient factual predicate for a guilty plea?

1 MR. LINDER: I do, your Honor. Is there any reason why I should not 2 THE COURT: accept it? 3 4 MR. LINDER: None. 5 THE COURT: Mr. Naftalis, do you agree that there's a 6 sufficient factual predicate for a guilty plea? 7 MR. NAFTALIS: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Is there any reason why I should not 8 9 accept it? 10 MR. NAFTALIS: No, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Mr. Majidi, at this time do you wish to 12 enter a plea of guilty in this case? 13 THE DEFENDANT: I do. 14 THE COURT: To Counts One, Two, Three and Four, sir? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, all four counts. THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Majidi, because you have 16 17 acknowledged that you are in fact quilty as charged in each of these counts of the indictment, because I am satisfied that you 18 know of your rights, including your right to go to trial, and 19 20 that you're aware of the consequences of your plea, including 21 the range of penalties that may be imposed, and finally because 22 I am comfortable that you are knowingly and voluntarily 23 pleading quilty, I will accept your quilty plea and I will 24 enter a judgment of guilty on Counts One through Four of this

25

indictment.

We talked about sentencing earlier, sir, and at some point in this case we will begin the process of sentencing. The United States Probation Office will want to interview you in connection with the presentence investigation report that it is preparing. I am going to order that that interview not take place unless one of your attorneys or a representative from their office is present with you. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, yes.

THE COURT: And sir, let me say something else to you, that is not legal advice, I just want to make that clear. Your attorneys give you legal advice, I do not.

If and to the extent that you choose to speak with the probation office, I would ask you to ensure that what you say to them is as complete and as accurate as it can be. And I say that because the presentence investigation report is something that I rely on very heavily when I impose sentence. That report is most useful to me when it is accurate and when it is complete. You will have an opportunity to review the report before I ever see it, as will your attorneys, as will the attorneys for the government. I invite you to review the report before I see it because there may be information in the report that you wish to modify, that you wish to correct, or that you wish to object to, and I want you to have that opportunity.

So again, that is not legal advice. I want you to

```
understand how the presentence investigation report factors
1
 2
      into my sentencing decisions. Do you understand that, sir?
 3
               THE DEFENDANT: I do.
               THE COURT: At this time, counsel, I'm asking both
 4
      sides, are we setting a control date?
5
6
               MR. NAFTALIS: I think that makes sense, your Honor.
 7
               THE COURT: How far out would you like to go?
8
     months?
9
               MR. NAFTALIS: Six months is fine.
10
               THE COURT: All right. Ms. Noriega, may we have a
11
      date, please?
12
               DEPUTY CLERK: Monday, April 29, at 3:00 p.m.
13
               THE COURT: At the moment, is that a date that works
14
      for both sides?
15
               MR. NAFTALIS: Yes, your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: Okay, thank you.
               MR. LINDER: Yes, your Honor.
17
18
               THE COURT: After comparing schedules, I decided I
19
      would prefer to have this sentencing date set in August.
20
               Ms. Noriega, could I have a date in August, please?
               DEPUTY CLERK: Friday, August 2nd, at 3:00 p.m.
21
22
               THE COURT: Again I'm going to presume that everyone
23
      is available for the August 2nd date, and you will let me know
24
      as it gets closer if you are not.
25
               I will ask the government to send its factual
```

statement to the probation office at the appropriate time, and the defense can arrange for the interview with the probation officer at the appropriate time as we get closer to. And I will remind the parties in case I don't have occasion to see you again that I would like the opening sentencing submission two weeks in advance of sentencing and the responsive sentencing submission one week in advance of sentencing so that I have enough time to address these issues and think about everything that's in them.

Mr. Naftalis, is there anything else that the government wishes me to do today?

MR. NAFTALIS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. And Mr. Linder, is there anything else you would like me to do today?

MR. LINDER: Your Honor, may we have one minute to confer with Mr. Naftalis?

THE COURT: Of course. And Mr. Nicholas as well, I presume.

MR. LINDER: Yes, my apologies.

(Pause)

MR. LINDER: Your Honor, in light of the colloquy that the Court had with Mr. Majidi about the medications the medical, I would request once the transcript is prepared that we have an opportunity to review it and ask that the Court redact that portion of it from the public record.

THE COURT: That's fine.

Let's go off the record.

(Discussion held off the record).

THE COURT: I think it is appropriate for the parties to have an opportunity to confer about what portions of the transcript contains sensitive information that is not necessary to be disclosed to the public. So I'm going to ask the court reporter, please, to send the transcript in the first instance before publishing it on the public record to the parties, and I'm going to ask them very promptly, upon receipt, to propose to me redactions. And I will review the redactions and give them my considered view on them.

You already know my views as to the appropriateness of transparency on the court record, but I accept that Mr. Majidi has given us information that, while important, is perhaps not necessary to be shared with the public. So I understand your concerns, and I will let the parties take the first crack at providing to me what they think should be redacted. But I do, again, understand from the parties that this is not to be a sealed transcript, and therefore it will not be.

Mr. Linder, does that make sense to you?

MR. ROSENBERG: Absolutely, your Honor.

THE COURT: And that's what we're going to do, and I believe that's clear to all who are present.

Mr. Linder, other than that issue, and I appreciate

you raising it, is there anything else that you want to address with me at this time?

MR. ROSENBERG: Nothing, your Honor.

Mr. Majidi, there are certain things that I am obligated to tell you, and I will tell you them now. At the time of your arrest there were conditions of pretrial release on which you were released. Do you recall that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: Do you recall perhaps signing a bond and signing other documents across the street?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Those conditions still apply. So I know you know that, but I am obligated to tell you this, so I am asking you, to the extent that you have committed to certain reporting schedules or things of that nature, they still apply. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: Also, at the moment, there is a date set in August for us to see each other again for your sentencing. There is the possibility that I may require you to appear in court prior to that date. Do you understand, sir, that if I obligate you, if I tell you that you have to be in court, that in fact you have to be in court, and if you are not in court on a date that I order, you could be charged with a separate offense, and that offense is known as bail jumping. Do you

understand that, sir? THE DEFENDANT: I do. THE COURT: So may I understand that if I order you to be in court, I will see you? THE DEFENDANT: You will see me, yes. THE COURT: That is what I need to know. Anything else that anyone else wants to bring to my attention in this proceeding? MR. NAFTALIS: No, thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you all very much for your patience this afternoon. MR. LINDER: Thank you, your Honor. (Adjourned)